UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,313	12/19/2001	David J.P. Baar	3121183.0019	9388

20988 7590 09/01/2005

OGILVY RENAULT LLP
1981 MCGILL COLLEGE AVENUE
SUITE 1600
MONTREAL, QC H3A2Y3
CANADA

EXAMINER	
HARRISON, CHANTE E	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2677	

DATE MAILED: 09/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/021,313	BAAR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chante Harrison	2677	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 June 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *9* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8 and 10-35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 6/8/05.

This action is made FINAL.

2. Claims 1-35 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 32 are independent claims. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 32-35 have been added. Claim 9 was previously canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1-17 19 and 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Robertson, et al, U.S. Patent 5,670,984, 9/1997.

As per independent claim 1, Robertson discloses a method for displaying a region of interest while transitioning between first and second locations for the region of interest within visual information on a display screen of a computer, comprising: applying a transformation to a border region of the region of interest in the visual

information (Figs. 4 & 8) to improve visual detail in a border region of the region of interest by creating a lens surface for the border region having a predetermined lens surface shape (i.e. the lens is shaped/sized according to user specification) (Fig. 4; col. 8, ll. 15-21; col. 11, ll. 14-16); and creating a presentation by overlaying the visual information on the lens surface (Fig. 9 "510 & 520") and projecting the lens surface with the visual information onto a plane (Fig. 9 "500") in a uniform direction aligned with a viewpoint (col. 5, ll. 40-47), wherein at least one of the lens surface shape and the viewpoint remain constant during the transitioning between the first and second locations (col. 4, ll. 25-30; col. 8-9, ll. 63-7), and displaying the presentation on the display screen (Fig. 2).

As per dependent claim 2, Robertson discloses the transformation transforms only a portion of the visual information in the region of interest (col. 3, ll. 45-47; Fig. 4).

As per dependent claim 3, Robertson discloses the portion is a border of the region of interest (i.e. thick border region surrounding the region of interest) (Fig. 8).

As per dependent claims 4, Robertson discloses the border region is a periphery of said transitional region of interest (i.e. columns adjacent the region of interest are peripheral to the region) (Fig. 8).

As per dependent claim 5, Robertson discloses the lens surface for the border region is defined by a distortion function (i.e. the surface of the border region is transformed/distorted in varying degrees of detail) (col. 8, ll. 17-21).

As per dependent claim 6, Robertson discloses the lens surface for the border region is defined by a predetermined portion of a lens surface for rendering the region of interest (i.e. the lens shape, e.g. length and/or width, is determined by the region of interest and the lens position relative to the distance of other image planes) (col. 6, ll. 35-50; col. 7, ll. 31-41).

As per dependent claim 7, Robertson discloses the predetermined portion is a border region of the lens surface for rendering the region of interest (i.e. side panels are adjacent the center region of interest and are used to render the image using the desired focus of the user) (Fig. 9; col. 8, ll. 22-25).

As per dependent claim 8, Robertson discloses the predetermined portion is a periphery of the lens surface for rendering the region of interest (i.e. columns adjacent the region of interest are peripheral to the region) (Fig. 8; col. 8, ll. 22-25).

As per dependent claim 10, Robertson discloses establishing a path between the first and second locations for the region of interest (i.e. the movement of the lens over the image) (col. 6, ll. 40-45).

As per dependent claim 11, Robertson discloses the path is established automatically by a predetermined program (i.e. the viewplane which is used to project the lens is controlled by the user or automatically by the stored program to alter the position of the plane) (col. 6, ll. 44-59).

As per dependent claim 12, Robertson discloses the path is established by user selection (i.e. the viewplane which is used to project the lens is controlled by the user or automatically by the stored program to alter the position of the plane) (col. 6, ll. 44-59).

As per dependent claim 13, Robertson discloses increasing resolution of the visual information in the region of interest (Fig. 8); and decreasing resolution of the visual information outside the region of interest (i.e. image portions adjacent the region of interest are displayed in varied degrees of detail) (col. 8, ll. 15-21).

As per dependent claim 14, Robertson discloses the transformation provides a smooth transition to the region of interest from an adjacent region (col. 6, ll. 40-45; col. 7, ll. 43-45), by blending increased and said decreased resolution visual information in predefined regions adjacent to the region of interest (col. 8, ll. 15-21).

As per dependent claim 15, Robertson discloses the blending is performed by averaging the increased and said decreased resolution visual information (i.e. displaying the adjacent regions next to the region of interest by varying the level of detail of the resolution of each to create a smooth/averaged display transformation) (col. 10, ll.10-16, 33-38).

As per dependent claim 16, Robertson discloses the blending is performed by admixing said increased and the decreased resolution visual information (i.e. displaying the region of interest in one font and the adjacent region in another font, such that the fonts are mixed to provide the appearance of motion of the lens) (col. 8, ll. 50-61).

As per dependent claim 17, Robertson discloses transmitting the presentation over a network to a remote computer (col. 2, ll. 6-19).

As per dependent claim 19, Robertson discloses the lens surface for rendering the region of interest is defined by the distortion function (i.e. the surface of the border region is transformed/distorted in varying degrees of detail) (col. 8, ll. 17-21).

As per dependent claim 20, Robertson discloses the region of interest, the lens surface, and the lens surface shape include a plurality of regions of interest, a plurality

of lens surfaces, and a plurality of lens surface shapes, respectively (i.e. a nested lens within a lensed image) (Fig. 9).

As per independent claim 32, Robertson discloses a method in a computer system (Fig. 2). The rationale as applied in the rejection of claim 1 applies herein.

As per dependent claims 33, the rationale as applied in the rejection of claim 1 applies herein.

As per dependent claim 34, the rationale as applied in the rejection of claim 13 applies herein.

As per dependent claim 35, the rationale as applied in the rejection of claim 13 applies herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 21, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson et al., U.S. Patent 5,670,984, 9/1997.

As per dependent claim 21, Robertson discloses the visual information could be a map or a text document (col. 1, ll. 29-30) having multiple pages (col. 7, ll. 64-67).

Robertson fails to specifically disclose the visual information includes newspapers, magazines, telephone directories, and maps.

However it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to incorporate selecting visual information from the group consisting of newspapers, magazines, telephone directories, and maps with the method of Robertson because a magazines, newspapers and telephone directories are documents having pages of text; and the content of the multi-page/line document disclosed by Robertson is exemplary of a document having content such as magazines, newspapers, maps and phone directories.

As per dependent claim 23, Robertson teaches the display system may be any display in any computer system (col. 2, ll. 7-12).

Robertson fails to specifically disclose the display screen is contained in a handheld device.

However it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to incorporate the display screen in a handheld device with the method of Robertson because a display system is usable in a computer system, and a handheld device is a type of a computer system.

As per dependent claim 24, Robertson discloses the visual information could be a text document (col. 1, ll. 29-30) having multiple pages (col. 7, ll. 64-67).

Robertson fails to specifically disclose the visual information is a newspaper page. However it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to incorporate a newspaper page as visual information with the method of Robertson because a newspaper is a document having multiple pages the multi-page document of Robertson could be a newspaper.

3. Claims 18, 22 and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson as applied to claims 1-17, 19-21, 23-24 and 31 above, and further in view of Tognazzini et al., U.S. Patent 5,731,805, 3/1998.

As per dependent claim 18, Robertson teaches retrieving and transmitting a text document for display (Fig. 8; col. 2, ll. 6-19).

Robertson fails to specifically disclose the visual information includes a portable document format (PDF) document, which Tognazinni discloses (col. 8,ll. 4-10; col. 11, ll. 7-16).

It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to have the visual information of Robertson include a portable document format (PDF), as Tognazinni teaches, because a text document that is transmitted between display systems is formatted such that the document is portable.

As per dependent claim 22, Robertson teaches modifying the resolution, e.g. magnification, of a portion of a viewed image as selected by a user.

Robertson fails to specifically disclose the visual information includes web page content, which Tognazzini discloses (col. 8, ll. 25-30).

It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to have the visual information of Robertson include web page content, as Tognazzini teaches, because retrieving visual information suggests that the displayable visual information is transmitted from one system to another, just as web page content is transmitted between systems.

As per dependent claim 25, Robertson teaches selecting visual information that is any of a text document, a map or graph (col. 1, ll. 29-30).

Robertson fails to specifically disclose the newspaper page includes a plurality of headlines, columns, articles, graphics, and advertisements, which Tognazzini discloses (col. 5,ll. 15-20; Figs. 8 & 16).

It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to have the visual information of Robertson include a plurality of headlines, columns, articles, graphics, and advertisements, as taught by Tognazzini, because a text, map or graph document include content which is any of a plurality of headlines, columns, articles, graphics, and advertisements that are used to relay information visually.

As per dependent claim 26, Robertson teaches selecting visual information that is any of a text document, a map or graph (col. 1,ll. 29-30), where text documents include selectable scalable content (Fig. 4).

Robertson fails to specifically disclose the region of interest includes a headline, a column, an article, a graphic, and an advertisement, which Tognazzini discloses (col. 5,ll. 15-20; Figs. 8 & 16).

It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to have the visual information of Robertson include a plurality of headlines, columns, articles, graphics, and advertisements, as taught by Tognazzini, because a text, map or graph document include content which is any of a plurality of headlines, columns, articles, graphics, and advertisements that are used to relay information visually.

As per dependent claim 27, Robertson discloses said lens surface shape has a shape corresponding to that of the region of interest (Fig. 8; col. 6, ll. 54-56).

As per dependent claim 28, Robertson discloses said lens surface shape has a shape corresponding to a column (Fig. 8).

As per dependent claim 29, Robertson discloses the transformation increases the font size within a portion of the column (i.e. the lens shows the image portion of the document in detail) (Fig. 8).

As per dependent claim 30, Robertson discloses said lens surface shape is tapered to provide a continuous transition on at least one side of the portion of the column to undistorted text (Fig. 8; col. 8, ll. 17-21).

As per independent claim 31, Robertson discloses a method as claimed in claim 18. Therefore the rationale applied in the rejection of claim18 applies herein.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 6/8/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues (pp. 8, Para 1-3) Robertson does not teach the viewpoint remains "constant" as claimed in the present invention.

In reply, Robertson teaches projecting an image into a view volume with respect to "a viewpoint" (col. 3-4, ll. 65-3). Thus "a viewpoint" implies that there is a single viewpoint, which is constant when the visual information is projected on the lens surface. Applicant claims that when projecting information onto a lens surface the viewpoint is constant. Robertson teaches that when the lens moves the viewpoint will move based on the movement of the lens (col. 4, ll. 25-30). Robertson's teaching implies that when the lens is not moving, as in the case of the Applicant's claim, the viewpoint is constant relative to the lens when the visual information is projected onto the lens. Therefore, Robertson teaches a viewpoint that remains constant when information is projected onto a lens surface.

Applicant argues (pp. 9, Para 1) Robertson does not teach a lens surface shape that remains constant.

In reply, Examiner agrees changing one object feature, such as width, without changing another object feature, such as height effectively changes the shape fo the object. However, Robertson teaches changing both height and width to effectively change the size of a region. Thus for example when changing both height and width of a square, the result is an enlarged square. Therefore the Examiner maintains that Robertson does not change the shape of the lens; and that the lens shape remains constant because two object features, e.g. width and height, are manipulated to change the size of the object and NOT the shape.

Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chante Harrison whose telephone number is 571-272-7659. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on 571-272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chante Harrison
Examiner
Art Unit 2677

August 9, 2005

SUMATI LEFKOWITZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER